REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 22 and 24-42 are now in the application. Claims 22 and 24-42 are subject to examination. Claims 22 and 36 have been amended. Claim 23 has been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 36 and 21 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

More specifically, the Examiner states that the abbreviation "RDP" must be defined in claim 36, and that the term "essentially without" is unclear in claim 22 (the Examiner mistakenly referred to claim 1).

The term "essentially" has been deleted from claim 22 and the term "remote desktop protocol" has replaced the abbreviation "RDP" in claim 36. Support for these changes is believed to be inherent within the claims as previously presented.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for clarification or cosmetic reasons. The changes are neither provided

for overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claim for any

reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-

identified Office Action, claims 22-35 and 37 have been rejected as being

obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,920,505 to Hals et al. in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,966,029 to Ahern and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,194,683 to Hind et

al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse, in part.

The limitations of claim 23 have been added into claim 22. Claim 22 now

specifies that prior to being sent to the client computer, the screen displays that

are transmitted to the client computer are generated on the server computer

using a window program routine of the operating system on the server computer

based on window and object parameters.

Generating screen displays using a window program routine of the server

computer based on window and object parameters clearly excludes HTML-based

systems.

Hind et al. discloses a method for authoring dynamic data (i.e. JavaScript)

included in a HTML document. Hals et al. teach a method for determining a

navigation path for a visitor to a Website. Both Hind et al. and Hals et al. are

clearly related to a Website that is based on HTML code.

Therefore, even if there were a suggestion to combine the teachings of Hind et al. and Hals et al. with the teaching of Ahern, the invention as defined by claim 22 would not have been obtained.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 13 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 36 and 38-42 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,920,505 to Hals et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,966,029 to Ahern, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,194,683 to Hind et al., and further in view of Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0165993 A1 to Kramer under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if there were a suggestion to combine the teaching of Kramer with that of Hals et al., Ahern, and Hind et al., the invention as defined by claims 36 and 38-42 would not have been obtained for the reasons given above with regard to claim 22.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 22. Claim 22 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 22.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 22 and 24-42 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable,

counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible,

patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within

a period of three months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $525.00

in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16

and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-

1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Laurence A. Greenberg/
Laurence A. Greenberg
(Reg. No. 29,308)

MPW:cgm

March 19, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101